

### **REMARKS**

Claims 1-17 and 19-29 are pending. Claims 1-17 and 19-29 stand rejected. Claims 1 and 22 have been amended. In view of the amendments to the claims and the following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejections be withdrawn and that the claims be allowed.

Applicant appreciates the time that Examiner Tanningco spent in discussing this case with Applicant's representative, Thomas Anderson, on January 27, 2010 and on February 1, 2010. The amendments made to claim 1 in this paper and the remarks regarding the amendments are consistent with the discussions that occurred between the Examiner and Mr. Anderson, as more fully explained in the following remarks.

Claim 22 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for lacking antecedent basis for the term "the lens array." In response to the rejection, claim 22 has been amended to recite "a lens array." Accordingly, the rejection is overcome and Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7-9, 16, 17 and 19-27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.K. Patent Application No. GB 2352512 to Ciesla et al. ("Ciesla"). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 recites a probe array for an imaging system for examining an object. The array includes "at least one emitter for emitting radiation, a plurality of detectors for detecting radiation and means for directing radiation emitted by the at least one emitter to the object and for directing radiation reflected from the object to at least two of the plurality of detectors." A "proportion of emitters and detectors are configured to be operated at different times." As explained below, Ciesla fails to teach each limitation of claim 1.

Ciesla relates to a probe assembly for examining a sample. Ciesla, Abstract. The Ciesla probe assembly includes an emitter and a plurality of detectors. Ciesla, fig. 11. Operation of the Ciesla probe necessarily requires that a proportion of the emitters and detectors operate at a same

time. However, nothing in Ciesla discloses that a proportion of the emitters and detectors are configured to operate at different times. In the discussions between the Examiner and Mr. Anderson, the Examiner agreed that Ciesla did not teach that a proportion of the emitters and detectors in Ciesla are operated at different times. Therefore, for at least these reasons, Ciesla fails to render claim 1 unpatentable.

Claims 2, 4, 5, 7-9, 16, 17 and 19-27 depend from claim 1 and are thus allowable for at least the same reasons that claim 1 is allowable. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn and that the claims be allowed.

Claims 10-13, 28 and 29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ciesla. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 10-13, 28 and 29 depend from claim 1. As explained above, claim 1 is allowable over Ciesla. Therefore, claims 10-13, 28 and 29 are also allowable over Ciesla for at least the same reasons that claim 1 is allowable. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn and that the claims be allowed.

Claims 3, 6, 14 and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ciesla in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0178584 to Arnone et al. (“Arnone”). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 3, 6, 14 and 15 depend from claim 1. As explained above, claim 1 is allowable over Ciesla for at least the reason that Ciesla fails to teach that a “proportion of emitters and detectors are configured to be operated at different times.” Arnone also fails to remedy this inadequacy of Ciesla.

Arnone is used in the Office Action to teach a THz imaging device with photoconductive emitter and detectors and raster scanning. Office Action, p. 6. However, Arnone fails to the operating of a proportion of emitters and detectors at different times. Therefore, neither Ciesla nor


Arnone, individually or combined, teach each limitation of claim 1 (and hence, claims 3, 6, 14 and 15).

For at least these reasons, claims 3, 6, 14 and 15 are allowable over the cited combination. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn and that the claims be allowed.

In view of the above, Applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance. If there are any additional charges in connection with this filing or any subsequent filings (including but not limited to issue fees), the Examiner is respectfully requested and authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 04-1073 therefor under Order No. M0025.0357/P357.

Dated: February 4, 2010

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Stephen A. Soffen

Registration No.: 31,063

Thomas D. Anderson

Registration No.: 56,293

DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO LLP

1825 Eye Street, NW

Washington, DC 20006-5403

(202) 420-2200

Attorneys for Applicant